REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 101 Rejection

Claims 7, 29, and 47 have been amended. Claims 7-12, 29-32, and 47-52 are directed to statutory subject matter, and thus are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Section 112 Rejection

Claims 6, 12, 18, 20, 35, 41, 47, 53, and 54 have been amended. Claims 6, 12, 18, and 35-54 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter the Applicants regard as the invention, and thus are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Section 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,699,310 to Garloff et al. ("*Garloff*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Garloff* fails to disclose, or even teach or suggest, the elements specifically recited in Claims 1-34. For example, *Garloff* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following elements recited in amended independent Claim 1:

> accessing a plurality of domain rules for a military theory, each domain rule being invariant;
> displaying a plurality of business rules for the military theory, each business rule being variable.

Garloff also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following elements recited in amended independent Claim 21:

> accessing a plurality of rules for a military theory;
> analyzing the rules to separate a plurality of domain rules of the military theory from a plurality of business rules of the military theory, each domain rule being invariant, each business rule being variable.

For at least these reasons, independent Claims 1 and 21 and their dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102. For analogous reasons, independent Claims 7, 13, 19, 20, 25, 29, 33, and 34 and their respective dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-34.

The Examiner rejects Claims 35-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0091990 to Little et al. ("*Little*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Little* fails to disclose, or even teach or suggest, the elements specifically recited in Claims 35-54. For example, *Little* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following elements recited in amended independent Claim 35:

> organizing a first subset of artifacts for display according to the first view, the first subset comprising a particular artifact;
> initiating display of the first subset of artifacts according to the first view; ...
> organizing a second subset of artifacts for display according to the second view, the second subset comprising the particular artifact; and
> initiating display of the second subset of artifacts according to the second view.

The Examiner points to Figures 12, 16, and 17 and related text of *Little* to teach these elements. (Office Action, pages 12-13.) According to the *Little*, Figure 16 illustrates custom access classes, and Figure 17 illustrates relational view classes:

> To accommodate customized data access, the programmer can create custom access classes 240, illustrated in FIG. 16.

(*Little*, paragraph 0183.)

> To build customized access other than composite view class, the programmer creates relational view classes 242, as shown in FIG. 17. Each relational view class represents a standard construct for creating a virtual table based on one or more existing relational table classes.

(*Little*, paragraph 0188.)

Figure 12 illustrates project level source, configuration, and make files:

> 4. As shown in FIG. 12, it creates another component package named ConfigAndBuild 234. This package contains a component which represents the project level source, configuration, and make files. It contains another

component representing a simple ubbconfig file that is also generated during the code generation phase.

(*Little*, paragraph 0162.)

That is, Figures 16 and 17 and Figure 12 illustrates different types of entities. Accordingly, the figures do not illustrate "organizing a first subset of artifacts for display according to the first view, *the first subset comprising a particular artifact*," and "organizing a second subset of artifacts for display according to the second view, *the second subset comprising the particular artifact*" (emphasis added).

For at least these reasons, independent Claim 35 and its dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102. For analogous reasons, independent Claims 41, 47, 53, and 54 and their respective dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 35-54.

26

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460

KI/ls
Correspondence Address:
Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6494
Date: June 22, 2007

Customer Number: **05073**